

REMARKS

In the Office Action, claims 1, 9-11 and 2 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cavaness et al. in view of Beeuwsaert and Foss, Jr. Claim 3 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cavaness et al in view of Beeuwsaert and Cove. Claims 4-8 were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Applicant would like to thank Examiner Lockett for the consideration given applicant's attorney at the interview of July 6, 2004. At the interview, agreement was reached to confirm the patentability of the claims subject to an expanded and updated search. In a telephone message left by Examiner Lockett on July 12, 2004, she confirmed that her expanded and updated search had not revealed any better prior art. The Examiner requested that a definition of "expanded polycarbonate" be added to the claims for clarity purposes only. This has been done.

Accordingly, the application should now be in condition for allowance. It is requested that U.S. Patent No. 5,747,711 to Cavaness which was relied upon in the Office Action, be made of record.


Based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the claims in the present application, as they now stand, patentably distinguish over the references cited and applied by the Examiner and are, therefore, in condition for

allowance. A Notice of Allowance is in order, and such favorable action and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

However, if after reviewing the above amendments and remarks, the Examiner has any questions or comments, he is cordially invited to contact the undersigned attorneys.

Respectfully submitted,

JACOBSON HOLMAN, PLLC

By: 
Jonathan L. Scherer
Reg. No. 29,851

400 Seventh Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004-2201
(202) 638-6666

Date: August 5, 2004
JLS/dmt